DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 819 HE 011 180

AUTHOR Straumanis, Joan; Laird, Judy
TITLE Job Crunch: The Affirmative Action Game.
INSTITUTION Denison Univ., Granville, Ohio.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 44p.; Reprint on federal laws and regulations concerning sex discrimination in educational institutions may not reproduce well (pages 10-13); Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility
AVAILABLE FROM Denison Simulation Center, Denison University, Granville, OH 43023 ($5.00 including game instructions)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Affirmative Action; *College Faculty; *Educational Games; *Employment Practices; Higher Education; Models; Racial Discrimination; *Role Playing; Sex Discrimination; *Simulation; Social Discrimination; Teacher Employment

ABSTRACT

Descriptive information, objectives, guidelines, and materials are presented for an affirmative action game designed to demonstrate a model for using simulation in teaching issues-oriented courses. The format of the game was adapted from that of PSYCH CITY. The game is designed to assist people in learning how an academic community might deliberate in a hiring situation involving the conflicting claims of candidates who are members of minority and majority groups. The hypothetical community is a small liberal arts college, and participants are asked to play roles and examine the factors that influence the decision-making process. The optimum number of participants is 25-30, but with some modifications fewer participants can be used. In addition to outlining roles, the following materials are included: equipment checklist, facilitator's guide, affirmative action fact sheet, federal affirmative action guidelines, a reprint of federal laws and regulations concerning sex discrimination in educational institutions, guidelines for group process observer roles, process observer recording forms, and an evaluation form. Information is presented on the development and modification of the game, the facilitation and debriefing of role-playing simulations, and limitations of the game. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169819

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan Straumanis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA | HE

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

HE 011 180

denison simulation center

denison university denison simulation center . granville, ohio 43023

CN 001188

(Abstract) "JOB CRUNCH", THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GAME

Dr. Judy Laird, History
Dr. Joan Straumanis, Philosophy
Denison University
Granville, Ohio 43023

JOB CRUNCH is a learning experience originally designed to demonstrate a model for using simulation in teaching issues-oriented courses such as Women's Studies. We adapted the format of this game from that of PSYCH CITY, a simulation of community conflict which was designed by Robert and Nancy Cohen of the Institute for Community Development of Syracuse, New York.

The purpose of JOB CRUNCH is to assist people in learning how an academic community might deliberate in a hiring situation involving the conflicting claims of candidates who are members of minority and majority groups. The simulation operates as a hypothetical community, in this case a small liberal arts college, with its own people, resources and problems. Participants are asked to play roles in this community and through these roles to examine the factors which influence the decision-making process.

The scenario in JOB CRUNCH is the following. Three candidates of diverse training and background are being interviewed for an opening in the English Department of the college. Members of the faculty and the administration, and invited students, meet the candidates in a "cocktail party" setting, which functions as a mixer. Next the various constituencies caucus briefly to plan strategies for the following phase, an open hearing to discuss the merits of the candidates and the obligations of the college under affirmative action guidelines. The issues of discrimination or "reverse discrimination" are likely to be raised at this stage. The hearing is conducted as a town meeting where participants try to come to consensus. They may present ideas, facts, and plans, attempt to persuade others, establish procedures and rules, caucus, and vote on issues and motions. Finally, participants decide by vote who is to be hired and the game ends.

The simulation concludes with a short debriefing session during which participants are asked to complete an evaluation questionnaire. The results of evaluations of past sessions, as well as role cards and instructions for play are available upon request.

The optimum number of participants is between 25-30, but with some modifications JOB CRUNCH can be played with fewer or more participants. At least two hours are needed for adequate development of relationships and themes.

In the paper being read at the NASAGA Conference we describe the game in more detail and discuss problems which arose during the development and testing of various versions of it. These remarks should be helpful to designers of role-playing simulations of many kinds.

"JOB CRUNCH", THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GAME

Dr. Judy Laird, History
Dr. Joan Straumanis, Philosophy
Denison University
Granville, Ohio 43023

Simulations in Women's Studies. Three categories of simulations are of particular interest to those involved in feminist studies and sex-role liberation. First are those exercises which explicitly teach or stimulate discussion of specific topics in a Women's Studies curriculum. Included in this group are simulations about such subjects as marriage and its alternatives, historical events such as the Seneca Falls Convention of 1848, sex education, abortion counseling, and so on. A second category involves simulations which are designed to explore feelings and social interactions that arise from sex roles. This is a more general classification than the last and includes all the so-called consciousness-raisers--or at least those exercises intended as such by their designers. The last and largest category includes those games which, while not intended as Women's Studies exercises, lend themselves to feminist-oriented debriefing. Examples in this group are simulations which explore the nature of our society (or an artificial one), evoke value statements, or give players opportunities to experience power relationships or practice assertiveness. In fact, any exercise in which males and females behave differently from one another, or differently from the way they normally do, is subject to a feminist debriefing. It might be argued that because of the pervasiveness of sex-differentiated behavior in our culture, nearly any complex activity can serve as the occasion for an examination of sexism or sex-role stereotyping.

JOB CRUNCH: A general description. "JOB CRUNCH" is a group learning exercise which fits into all three categories. First, its explicit content is Affirmative Action in the academic job market, a specific item in the Women's Studies curriculum; second, it seeks to help participants become aware of their own attitudes and those of others toward discrimination in hiring; and, third, like most simulations involving role playing, it elicits the sort of unpremeditated behavior which lends itself to examination in terms of sex role socialization and sexist attitudes. It was designed to demonstrate one model for using simulation in teaching issue-oriented courses such as Women's Studies, a model which the designers believe is modifiable by users to fit a wide variety of situations and issues. Certain elements of the exercise are themselves modifications of features of PSYCH CITY, a simulation of community conflict which was developed by Robert and Nancy Cohen of the Institute for Community Development of Syracuse, New York. In fact it was during a demonstration of PSYCH CITY at the 1975 NASAGA Conference in Los Angeles that the authors of JOB CRUNCH began their collaboration, and the immediate stimulus was the observation that rich material on sex roles and attitudes that had emerged in the course of playing PSYCH CITY was being overlooked in the debriefing. We resolved to design a simulation as flexible and rich as PSYCH CITY, but which paid particular attention to sexism and feminist issues. The product which emerged combines this concern with an examination of one aspect of racism as well, and encourages discovery of the structural links between sexism and racism in academia.

The scenario of JOB CRUNCH is the following: Three candidates of diverse background are competing for a teaching position in the English Department of a small liberal arts college. Affirmative Action is an issue in the decision because the candidates differ in sex, race, and the prestige of their credentials. Participants in the simulation are asked to play roles in this hypothetical community, and through these roles, which are partly specified and partly open-ended, to examine the political, psychological and social systems which influence the decision-making process in academic hiring. A few participants act as process observers instead of being given roles as members of the academic community; they have specific processing assignments, to be reported upon in the final debriefing.

A sequence of activities comprise the experience, each of which has a specific purpose. The first, continuum, is a preliminary exercise designed to get participants on their feet and moving, to help them establish rounded and realistic role identities for themselves, and to reduce their inhibition. Second, a cocktail party, or mixer, enables players to meet and question the "candidates" and other principles in an informal setting, and to establish relationships and alliances. (If appropriate and financially feasible, real beer is a useful prop at this stage.) Next comes a short caucus period in which participants in similar roles meet in physically separate and homogeneous groupings to establish their group goals and develop some of the arguments they are prepared to advance during the next phase, the hearing. The hearing is the focus of the simulation and is represented to be a decision-making session, using a town meeting format, in which "faculty", "administrators" and other "invited guests", including "student representatives" decide which of the three candidates should be hired. During the hearing, participants may offer arguments, data and proposals, attempt to persuade others, establish procedures and rules, and take votes on issues and motions. They are also permitted to lobby, caucus and protest. The hearing is chaired by the person playing the role of "President of the Faculty", and it begins in a structured manner with short presentations, first from the "Affirmative Action Officer" (who has been provided with a packet of materials on the characteristics of the simulated college, and the requirements of the law), and then from each of the candidates. The floor is then opened for questioning and discussion.

At a time deemed appropriate by the facilitators, the hearing is terminated and a vote is taken to determine the outcome. Immediately afterward, evaluation forms are distributed, following which the facilitators conduct a debriefing of the experience. During the debriefing, the process observers make their reports, participants discuss their feelings and observations about the simulation, and the facilitators make their objectives explicit. In this final stage, participants are asked to comment on the appropriateness of the goals of the simulation and whether they consider them to have been achieved.

With firm leadership from the facilitators, the entire exercise can be accomplished in 2 to 2 1/2 hours, but participants have usually continued the discussion beyond the formal conclusion of the simulation. The optimal number of players is 25-30, but fewer or more can be accommodated by means

of suitable adjustments in the roles. Facilities and materials needed are a large room which can be cleared in the middle for the "cocktail party", but with sufficient seating for the "hearing"; color-coded role cards, name tags and ballots for all who are playing academic roles; special printed instructions for the process observers; an information packet for each participant (containing candidates' "dossiers", data about the college and documents summarizing the applicable Affirmative Action laws); conspicuous paste-on face markers to indicate sex and race; felt-tipped pens; pins (for name tags); a gavel; and, if desired, drinks for the "cocktail party."

Development and modification of JOB CRUNCH. As a result of testing JOB CRUNCH on two very different audiences, first at a Great Lakes College Association Women's Studies conference at Earlham College in March 1976, and three months later at the Denison Summer Simulation Conference, the simulation has gone through several modifications. Both the Earlham and Denison versions used six candidate roles instead of three in an attempt to examine a variety of issues relevant to academic hiring; among the issues we earlier explored but later dropped were joint husband-wife appointments and the effects of a history of political activism upon a candidate's chances of employment. The two trial runs convinced us that only a more simplified version of the scenario could do justice to the issues we intended to feature, racial and sexual discrimination. For the same reason, namely to focus attention on the target issues, we reluctantly cut down drastically on the number of student roles. In the Denison experience, particularly, where the number of participants was unexpectedly large (55), those playing student roles noisily and effectively prevented serious discussion of Affirmative Action in the hearing phase by defining the main issue as student power rather than racial and sexual discrimination. By reducing the proportion and limiting the absolute number of student roles (in the case of a large group), and by other modifications (for example, eliminating distinctions in the amount of information and power accorded to those in faculty and student roles), we hope in the future to guarantee greater focus on Affirmative Action, but at a considerable cost in realism and in the opportunity to explore related and important issues.

Another problem encountered in the course of the Earlham and Denison demonstrations also resulted in a decision to sacrifice realism for the sake of playability. The original set of roles had included a number of "passive" roles (faculty wives, junior faculty fearful of "making waves", and so on), roles that were so limited in terms of institutional power that only by means of manipulation or influence could the player hope to affect the outcome. These roles allowed little scope for interaction in the hearing phase of the simulation, causing considerable participant dissatisfaction. Particularly poignant was the plight of several real faculty wives who, by the luck of the draw, were required to act the frustrating part of faculty wife, a role they already knew too well. Although being assigned to such a role can be highly instructive to many, these roles were eliminated from the final version of JOB CRUNCH in order to maintain focus on the main issues and to enhance participants' morale. On the basis of this experience, we would advise designers of role-playing simulations to keep passive roles, however realistic,

out of their games, or to make them very pointed in purpose--or brief in duration.

Facilitating and debriefing role-playing simulations. This problem, of the morale of participants given passive roles to play, points up a more general one--the problem of whether to control role assignments. A random distribution of roles is easiest to accomplish but often results in an unwanted matching of the characteristics of persons and roles. With occasional exceptions, the learning value of a simulation is reduced if participants "play themselves" to any great extent. We found this particularly problematic in the case of role players who are normally in a "disadvantaged" category within the academic decision-making structure: for example, faculty wives, students and minority group members. Problems like this arise in all role-playing situations, and are not peculiar to JOB CRUNCH.

Another problem common to many role-playing simulations is deciding which role characteristics ought to be left to a player's choice and which should be specified by the designers. In JOB CRUNCH we have taken pains not to specify some crucial items, the most notable omission being sex, in the case of most of the roles. The observation that launched the project was that in the case of the demonstration of PSYCH CITY at Los Angeles, nearly all participants, even women, assigned themselves male names when given roles of power, prestige or authority. In debriefing JOB CRUNCH, we ask participants to reflect on the reasons for their choice of sex where this was unspecified on the role card, and to assess the social significance of those reasons (or more often, to evaluate the significance of an automatic, unreasoned choice).

Allowing players to choose their sex is one way to create an opportunity for feminist consciousness-raising in debriefing a simulation.* Of course there are others. The phenomenon of caricature, for example, is a problem for JOB CRUNCH and many other simulations, but one which presents a singular debriefing opportunity. Participants are most likely to resort to caricature when they attempt to take on unfamiliar roles. But it has sometimes been surprising how JOB CRUNCH players have stereotyped what we had hoped were increasingly familiar personae in the academic world: females described on the role cards as "extremely competent" or "feminist", Affirmative Action Officers, Black faculty and students, student leaders. Even where players protest that their hamming was "all in fun", it is profitable to examine, in a non-judgmental way, the sources and significance of stereotyped protrayals. Several comments made in the debriefing of the Denison demonstration of JOB CRUNCH illustrate the value of attending carefully to stereotypical role-playing. One participant (male) initiated a good discussion on the nature of feminism when he defended his boisterous and disruptive behavior during the simulation

*Allowing role-players to choose their own race is less successful as a consciousness-raising device because too few white participants elect to play the role of Blacks. Since the presence of some Blacks is important to the scenario, we have chosen to guarantee this by specifying race on the role cards.

by claiming that his role description ("strong feminist") left him no other choice. Another man at the same session, reflecting on his own similar behavior in the role of a student, argued that he and other faculty members present were playing students of the 60's, not of the 70's; in other words, they were acting out what they most feared, a return of student power. The simulation was an opportunity, for him at least, to objectify and deal with an imagined threat. Regrettably, by revising JOB CRUNCH so as to sharpen its focus we have reduced the opportunity for serendipitous self-discoveries of this sort, a deliberate trade-off in this case.

The authors of JOB CRUNCH faced another question that must be familiar to many designers of role-playing simulations: Should the facilitators play roles or not? That is, should the experience be directed from within the simulation scenario or from the outside? At first we naively thought that, by using the nominal title "President of the Faculty", a facilitator could simply chair the hearing phase of the exercise without assuming a particular role character. But during the Earlham demonstration, it became clear that "neutral" administration, of the hearing at least, was impossible to bring off; the chair was being forced to take sides on procedural and substantive issues that necessarily affected the course of play. In fact, the skills, attitudes and personal traits assumed by the person in the chair had at least as decisive an effect on the direction of the game as any other single factor--and none of these characteristics had been written into the role in advance. The facilitator was forced to construct herself a role personality on the spot--meanwhile gaining a useful lesson about the possibility of neutrality in real administrative situations!

In trying to solve this problem afterwards, we decided that during the period of trial and modification of JOB CRUNCH it was useful for the hearing to be chaired by a facilitator/author in order to maintain control of the process, and even to allow for on-the-spot changes of course in extremity. Therefore, in preparing for the Denison demonstration, we developed a full role description for the chair, this time assigning to the role the title "Head of the English Department" and giving it considerable power within the simulated college. Repeating another control device we had tried at Earlham, we also assigned a knowledgeable facilitator to the important position of "Affirmative Action Officer"--which we considered a teaching role, vital to our objectives.

We now believe that the simulation has been developed to a point which permits the facilitators to withdraw entirely from internal roles and to confine their participation to providing introductions, instructions and transitions, and of course, conducting the debriefing. This is an important step in making the simulation generally available, and playable by groups with no special expertise in Affirmative Action. Accordingly, we have attempted to provide data packets and instructions which are simple and self-explanatory.

Objectives of JOB CRUNCH. It has already been reported that in modifying JOB CRUNCH, some of the original objectives have been sacrificed in order to achieve a greater degree of focus on primary goals. Thus, for example, the interesting issue of job sharing as one response to a tight market is very unlikely to be raised now that we have eliminated the roles of the husband and wife applying for a joint appointment. However, the goals of the simulation

remain ambitious. Among those we still consider it important and reasonable to strive for are the following: to convey factual information about Affirmative Action in academic hiring; to clarify the distinctions between Affirmative Action, preferential hiring and "reverse discrimination", and to elicit from participants arguments for and against each of these; to develop empathy for candidates and employers in a tight job market; to promote sensitivity to factors that are or should be relevant to academic hiring decisions; to experience and understand some of the group dynamics of decision-making in academia; to motivate further study of job discrimination and Affirmative Action, for example in a Women's Studies course; to "raise the consciousness" of participants regarding racism, sexism and the relationships between the two problems; and last, a goal not to be minimized, to provide an engaging and intellectually demanding social experience (a "mixer") for use by classes, conferences and retreats concerned with human relations, simulation and gaming, Women's Studies, Black Studies, academic administration, and other themes.

Some limitations of JOB CRUNCH: This rather presumptuous list of goals (or hopes) for JOB CRUNCH can be defended only by reference to a feature of the exercise that is also its chief limitation. To the extent that a simulation specifies players' responses to varying situations it is more game than drama. And conversely, the more open-ended the possible responses, the less game-like the simulation. On this continuum, JOB CRUNCH, with its reliance upon open-ended role-playing, falls far in the direction of drama (improvisation). But playing a role requires talent and knowledge. The many rewards of a complex role-playing simulation cannot be realized in a naive group. In JOB CRUNCH, for example, the arguments regarding Affirmative Action are elicited, not provided. Speaking on another level, it takes a person who has suffered under administrators who speak platitudes to convincingly play the role of a college president who tries to placate all factions--and only if this role is played properly can the conflict between complacent administrators and agents of social change be illustrated or understood. So, while one strength of JOB CRUNCH is the rich opportunity it offers to knowledgeable players, this limits the target population which can benefit from it. Present or recent members of academic communities (universities, colleges, community colleges or public school systems), including faculty, administrators, undergraduate or graduate students, or members of their families, are the intended audience for JOB CRUNCH. But this brings to the simulation a class bias that limits its relevance; for example the problems of Affirmative Action in factory employment, though related, are untouched, and the present design includes no mechanism to insure that participants are made aware of this shortcoming.

Another limitation, or problem, is the illusion of realism. Because some aspects of the simulation appear highly realistic (and talented role-players may reinforce that impression), it is important to emphasize here and in the debriefing of JOB CRUNCH that a decision procedure such as an open and representative hearing, together with explicit efforts to introduce data and arguments regarding Affirmative Action, is almost never encountered in a real hiring situation. Participants need to be warned that JOB CRUNCH

is not a simulation of academic hiring procedures, but is rather a highly contrived opportunity for gaining information and airing feelings about discrimination and its remedies in the academic job market.

NOTE: Please address inquiries to Dr. Straumanis at Denison University.

JOB CRUNCH:
THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GAME

Joan Straumanis
Department of Philosophy
Denison University

Copyright pending:
Joan Straumanis
Denison Simulation Center
Denison University
Granville, Ohio
1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1
Equipment Checklist 2
Facilitator's Guide 3
Priority List of Roles 7
Affirmative Action Fact Sheet 8
Federal Affirmative Action Guidelines 9
Federal Laws and Regulations Concerning
Sex Discrimination in Educational Institutions (Reprint) 10
Dossiers of Candidates 14
Candidates' Roles 15
Students' Roles 16
Administrative Roles 17
Faculty Roles 18
Group Process Observer Roles 20
Guidelines for Group Process Observers 21
Process Observer Recording Form (Structure).....22
Process Observer Recording Form (Climate).....23
Process Observer Recording Form (Facilitattion) 24
Process Observer Recording Form (Dysfunctions) 25
Process Observer Recording Form (Convergence) 26
Evaluation Form 27

INTRODUCTION

JOB CRUNCH is a learning experience originally designed to demonstrate a model for using simulation in teaching issues-oriented courses such as Women's Studies. The format of this game was adapted from that of PSYCH CITY, a simulation of community conflict which was designed by Robert and Nancy Cohen of the Institute for Community Development of Syracuse, New York.

The purpose of JOB CRUNCH is to assist people in learning how an academic community might deliberate in a hiring situation involving the conflicting claims of candidates who are members of minority and majority groups. The simulation operates as a hypothetical community, in this case, a small liberal arts college, with its own people, resources and problems. Participants are asked to play roles in this community and through these roles to examine the factors which influence the decision-making process.

The scenario in JOB CRUNCH is the following. Three candidates of diverse training and background are being interviewed for an opening in the English Department of the college . Members of the faculty and the administration, and invited students, meet the candidates in a "cocktail party" setting, which functions as a mixer. Next the various constituencies caucus briefly to plan strategies for the following phase, an open hearing to discuss the merits of the candidates and the obligations of the college under affirmative action guidelines. The issues of discrimination or "reverse discrimination" are likely to be raised at this stage. The hearing is conducted as a town meeting where participants try to come to consensus. They may present ideas, facts, and plans, attempt to persuade others, establish procedures and rules, caucus, and vote on issues and motions. Finally, participants decide by vote who is to be hired and the game ends.

Optimum number of participants: 25-30
Optimum time allotment: 2 hours

JOB CRUNCH

EQUIPMENT CHECKLIST

In the Job Crunch package

1. Description of Job Crunch
2. Facilitator's Guide (Game Outline)
3. Priority List of Roles
4. Role Descriptions (to be reproduced on color-coded paper):

   3 Candidates roles (yellow
   4 Student roles (pink)
   7 Administration roles (blue)
   11 Faculty roles (green)
   5 Process Observer roles (white)

5. Affirmative Action Fact Sheet (Master to be reproduced - both sides - and distributed during the "cocktail party.")
6. Federal Laws and Regulations (Master to be reproduced - both sides - and distributed during the "cocktail party.")
7. Dossiers of Candidates (Master to be reproduced - both sides - and distributed during the "cocktail party.")
8. Guidelines for Group Process Observers (Reproduce 5 copies)
9. Process Observer Recording Forms
   (5 supplied, one for each Process Observer.)
10. Simulation Evaluation Form (Master to be reproduced and distributed during debriefing.)
11. Equipment Checklist (this page)

What you must provide in addition:

1. Color-coded name tags:

   3 yellow (candidates)
   4 pink (students)
   7 blue (administrators)
   11 gree (faculty)
   5 white (process observers)

2. Color-coded role cards (xerox on colored paper from masters provided and separate with scissors.)
3. Pins for name tags
4. Felt markers or crayons for name tags
5. Red stickers (post office type) for marking name tags of female characters.
6. Black construction paper cards (larger than name tags) to use as backing for name tags of Black characters.
7. Gavel for use by president of the faculty at the hearing.
8. Sufficient quantities of Affirmative Action Fact Sheets, Federal Laws and Regulations, Dossiers of Candidates and Evaluation Forms for distribution to all. (May be distributed in advance if feasible). Also, sufficient copies of Group Process Observer Guidelines for distribution to Process Observers.
9. Drinks for the "cocktail party" (optional!)

JOB CRUNCH

Facilitator's Guide

I. Welcome to Job Crunch, a simulation of hiring at a small liberal arts college in the year 1976. The scenario is essentially this: participants will take role assignments as members of the faculty, administration, student body, and as job applicants at the college (candidates). In addition some participants will be asked to observe the simulation and record their observations on special forms. At the end of the simulation they will share their analyses with the group/participants. (N.B.: Those who draw Process Observer Recording Cards will meet separately with one of the facilitators during the Warm-up Continuum Phase.)

2 minutes

Without further explanation at this time, let's begin.

II. Hand out role assignments. CAUTION: Do not show your role descriptions to anyone. All roles are color coded.

Announce:

Please NOTE: Faculty - green
Administration - blue
Candidates - yellow
Students - pink
Observers - white

2 minutes

Look around and see who else has your color.

Announce:

All persons who drew white slips please join game co-leader for special instructions. Others should not speak with or interact with person having white tags throughout the game.

Announce:

All those who drew roles within the campus community, please group in center of room.

CONTINUUM: TO HELP YOU GET A FEEL FOR YOUR ROLES . . .

Respond to the following terms or phrases in terms of how you feel (like Very Much..Neutral..Dislike Very Much) by moving to the left side, the center, or the right side of the room, respectively.

10 minutes

Questions:

How do you feel about ...
1. Football
2. Diet Cola
3. Barbara Walters

How do you/how does your role character feel about ...
4. To be called or to call people "MS."
5. Jimmy Carter
6. Yogurt
7. The ERA

How does your role character feel about ...
8. Abortion on demand
9. People who say "far out."
10. National Health Insurance (Socialized medicine)

11. To take or teach a course in Black Studies
12. To smoke "pot."
13. To join a men's or women's CR (consciousness-raising) group.

III. Name Tags

Now that you have a feel for your character, take a colored card which corresponds to your role character's color. On this card, using your own last name, write what your role character would prefer to be called,(e.g., "Dr. Jones").

(Note: Process Observers leave their white name tags BLANK - no names or descriptions.)

10 minutes After you write your name, list your occupation (job title), e.g., Chemistry Professor.

Also, based on the role description and your feeling for the character, list five or six things about your character which you feel s/he would like other people to know, i.e., your character's professional and community identity. In the remainder of the simulation, act as you think that character might. When you've finished, pin these name tags on.

Female role characters and Black role characters contact Facilitators for props (red dots & black cards). Place red dots (stickers) on name tags of those playing female roles. Use black cards as backing for name tags of those playing black roles.

Announce:

Red dots mean...
Black cards mean...

IV. Cocktail Party (evening)

Pretend you're at a cocktail party being held on campus for the purpose of introducing job candidates to the campus community. (Dossiers of the three candidates as well as other descriptive material can be picked up at leader's station.)

20 minutes

Begin to socialize, as if at a cocktail party. Be sure to meet the candidates ("size them up" and match them with their dossiers), know who your colleagues are, and by all means, introduce yourselves to the President of the College, the Chairperson of the English Department, the Affirmative Action Officer and the President of the Faculty.

V. Caucus

Move forward in time to the next afternoon. As a preliminary step in choosing which of the three candidates is most qualified, the administration has urged the faculty and students to meet separately, in caucus sessions, to discuss the issues involved in hiring. At this time the Administration will also meet to discuss campus hiring policies.

(continued next page)

At these separate meeting, try to establish group goals, and develop justifications for your preference in candidates. Facilitator suggests physical locations for caucuses.

Options:

Affirmative Action Officer can be invited to join a caucusing group to explain legal considerations.

Candidates can be invited separately to be privately interviewed by each group.

Process Observers (white tags) may observe any group in caucus but may not participate.

VI. Hearing (A few minutes later)

Facilitators: Contact President of the Faculty and ask him/her to convene the faculty. (Students may attend and vote. Candidates are present, but may not vote.)

A. Introductions -- President of Faculty (chairperson)
Introductory Remarks -- Affirmative Action Officer
Candidates, A. B and C

B. The Chair: Conducts Hearing as s/he sees fit.

VII. Arbitrary End of Hearing -- VOTE is taken by asking players to walk over and join candidates of their choice. (All participants except Process Observers.)

VIII. DEBRIEFING:

While evaluation form is being filled out, Process Observers meet to exchange impressions/observations and decide on presentation.

Evaluation Forms distributed.

Exchanges: Explore feelings of participants--

Anger, manipulation, energized, effective in roles?
Easy to get into role character? Did you caricature it?
What emotions did you experience?

Observations:

from participants: Factions leadership styles, learning experience Power and its use?
What did you learn...?

affirmative action
human behavior
group/team building
cooperation
sex roles/sterotyping
racial stereotyping

Job Crunch
Facilitator's Guide
(Game outline)

Group Observers Report:

impartial observers--not committed to the simulation
not emotionally involved

OBJECTIVES:

a) show legitimate goal conflict at work in hiring process
b) explore role of subjectivity in hiring process
c) demonstrate how informal influence is exerted--socializing, liking patterns, behind-the-scenes manipulation
d) let participants experience the feelings of role characters
e) show relationship between sexism and racism
f) demonstrate use of simulation (transfer)
g) teach arguments for and against Affirmative Action
h) let participants become aware of group process

PRIORITY LIST OF ROLES

To facilitators:
Distribute role descriptions in the following order to obtain optimal conditions of interaction for groups of fewer than 25 participants. For gatherings of 25 or more, these priorities may be safely disregarded. (Using these distribution guidelines, the designers have conducted the simulation successfully with as few as 15 players; theoretically, the exercise could be run with a group as small as 9 or 10 persons, but the authors advise that the "caucus" component be omitted when working with such small groups.)

1.	Candidate A - Black Male	(Cand.)
2.	Candidate B - Ivy League White Male	(Cand.)
3.	Candidate C - White Female	(Cand.)
4.	President of College	(Admin.)
5.	Provost	(Admin.)
6.	Affirmative Action Officer	(Admin.)
7.	Chaplin	(Fac.)
8.	President of Faculty	(Fac.)
9.	Head of English Department	(Fac.)
10.	Assoc. Prof. of English - single, leftist	(Fac.)
11.	Assoc. Prof. of English - ex-Dean of Students	(Fac.)
12.	Asst. Prof. of English - untenured, Ph.D.	(Fac.)
13.	Asst. Prof. of English - untenured, no degree	(Fac.)
14.	Chairperson of Advisory Board	(Fac.)
15.	Asst. Dean - counsellor, Black	(Admin.)
16.	Asst. Prof. of Political Science - Black	(Fac.)
17.	Head of Black Student's Union	(Stud.)
18.	Editor of Student Newspaper	(Stud.)
19.	President of Women's Caucus	(Stud.)
20.	President of Student Government Assoc.	(Stud.)
21.	Trustee - Alumnus	(Admin.)
22.	Trustee - President of Corporation	(Admin.)
23.	Assoc. Prof. of English - Advisory Board Member	(Fac.)
24.	Poet-in-Residence	(Fac.)
25.	Lecturer in English - M.A., untenured	(Fac.)

Group Process Observers (26-30)

Structure
Climate
Facilitation
Dysfunctions
Convergence

NOTE: In groups of 21-25, omit role characters 21-25 and use one or more process observers. If 20 or less, omit process observers.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FACT SHEET

FACTS ABOUT THE COLLEGE

This is a four-year private liberal arts college, located in a rural area in this state. Although informal ties are maintained with the Methodist congregations which founded the college in 1891, it is now essentially non-sectarian. The college retains some of its former conservatism despite recent changes, including strenuous attempts to recruit minority students. Women and minority group members are still seriously under-represented on the faculty. The college has adopted an Affirmative Action plan although it does not fall into the class of institutions compelled to do so by the government.

Enrollment:	2400 undergraduates (a slight decrease from last year)
Minority Student Enrollment:	146 (6%)
Faculty:	170 FTE (Full Time Equivalents)
Endowment:	$20,000,000
Annual Budget:	$13,000,000
Average Annual Receipts from Government Contracts:	$15,000

FEDERAL AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GUIDELINES

1. Since March 1973, all institutions with 15 or more employees, or $10,000 in Government Contracts, are forbidden to discriminate.

2. Since October 1968, all organizations with at least 50 employees and $50,000 worth of Government Contracts, are required to submit Affirmative Action plans to the Federal Government.

DEFINITIONS

Discrimination in Employment: Hiring, training or promoting employees, or distributing salaries or benefits on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex.

Affirmative Action: Affirmative Action includes and goes beyond equal employment opportunity (nondiscrimination). It is the affirmative effort to recruit, employ and promote qualified individuals who are members of groups formerly excluded or under-represented. Such efforts typically include monitoring personnel prodedures to prevent discrimination, and widening the applicant "pool" to include more women and minority group members. "Goals" must be set but rigid "quotas" are illegal.

Preferential Hiring)
Compensatory Hiring): Federal Affirmative Action guidelines do not require -- in fact forbid — preferential or compensatory hiring. These are employment practices consistently favoring women and minority group members over equally - or better-qualified white males. (Preferential or compensatory hiring does not necessarily entail hiring unqualified candidates but does often involve hiring candidates who are less qualified than the best available.)

Reverse Discrimination: A term sometimes used to refer to preferential hiring by opponents of that practice.

Minority Group Members: U.S. citizens who are Afro-Americans, Asian Americans, Notive Americans or Hispanic.

Federal Laws[1] and Regulations Concerning Sex Discrimination in Educational Institutions[2]

October, 1972

Compiled by Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges

	Executive Order 11246 as amended by 11375	Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972	Equal Pay Act of 1963 as amended by the Education Amendments of 1972 (Higher Education Act)	Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Higher Education Act)[13]	Title VII (Section 799A) & Title VIII (Section 845) of the Public Health Service Act as amended by the Comprehensive Health Manpower Act & the Nurse Training Amendments Act of 1971[18]
Effective date	Oct. 13, 1968	March 24, 1972 (July 1965 for non-professional workers.) (Institutions with 15-24 employees are not covered until March 24, 1973.)	July 1, 1972 (June, 1964, for non-professional workers.)	July 1, 1972 (Admissions provisions effective July 1, 1973.)	Nov. 18,1971
Which institutions are covered	All institutions with federal contracts of over $10,000.[7]	All institutions with 15 or more employees	All institutions.	All institutions receiving federal monies by way of a grant, loan, or contract (other than a contract of insurance or guaranty).	All institutions receiving or benefiting from a grant, loan guarantee, or interest subsidy to health personnel training programs or receiving a contract under Title VII or VIII of the Public Health Service Act.[19]
What is prohibited?	Discrimination in employment (including hiring, upgrading, salaries, fringe benefits, training, and other conditions of employment) on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or sex. Covers all employees.	Discrimination in employment (including hiring, upgrading, salaries, fringe benefits, training, and other conditions of employment) on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or sex. Covers all employees.	Discrimination in salaries (including almost all fringe benefits) on the basis of sex. Covers all employees.	Discrimination against students or others[14] on the basis of sex.[15]	Discrimination in admission of students on the basis of sex and against some employees.[20]
Exemptions from coverage	None.	Religious institutions are exempt with respect to the employment of individuals of a particular religion or religious order (including those limited to one sex) to perform work for that institution. (Such institutions are not exempt from the prohibition of discrimination based on sex, color and national origin.)	None.	Religious institutions are exempt if the application of the anti-discrimination provisions are not consistent with the religious tenets of such organizations. Military schools are exempt if their primary purpose is to train individuals for the military services of the U.S. or the merchant marine. Discrimination in admissions[16] is prohibited only in vocational institutions (including vocational high schools), graduate and professional institutions, and public undergraduate coeducational institutions.	None.
Who enforces the provisions?	Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) of the Department of Labor has policy responsibility and oversees federal agency enforcement programs. OFCC has designated HEW as the Compliance Agency responsible for enforcing the Executive Order for all contracts with educational institutions. HEW's Office for Civil Rights (Division of Higher Education) conducts the reviews and investigations.	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).[17]	Wage and Hour Division of the Employment Standards Administration of the Department of Labor.	Federal departments and agencies which are empowered to extend financial aid to educational programs and activities. HEW's Office for Civil Rights (Division of Higher Education) is expected to have primary enforcement powers to conduct the reviews and investigations.[17]	HEW's Office for Civil Rights (Division of Higher Education) conducts the reviews and investigations.

How is a complaint made?	By letter to OFCC or Secretary of HEW	By a sworn complaint form obtainable from EEOC	By letter, telephone call, or in person to the nearest Wage and Hour Division office	Procedure not yet specified. A letter to Secretary of HEW is acceptable	Procedure not yet specified. A letter to Secretary of HEW is acceptable
Can complaints of a pattern of discrimination be made as well as individual complaints?	Yes. However, individual complaints are referred to EEOC.	Yes.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Who can make a complaint?	Individuals and/or organizations on own behalf or on behalf of aggrieved employee(s) or applicant(s).	Individuals and/or organizations on own behalf or on behalf of aggrieved employee(s) or applicant(s). Members of the commission may also file charges.	Individuals and/or organizations on own behalf or on behalf of aggrieved employee(s).	Individuals and/or organizations on own behalf or on behalf of aggrieved party.	Individuals and/or organizations on own behalf or on behalf of aggrieved party.
Time limit for filing complaints	180 days.	180 days.	No official limit, but recovery of back wages is limited by statute of limitations to two years for a nonwillful violation and three years for a willful violation.	Procedure not yet determined.	Procedure not yet determined.
Can investigations be made without complaints?	Yes. Government can conduct periodic reviews without a reported violation, as well as in response to complaints. Pre-award reviews are mandatory for contracts over $1,000,000.	No. Government can conduct investigations only if charges have been filed.	Yes. Government can conduct periodic reviews without a reported violation as well as in response to complaints.	Yes. Government can conduct periodic reviews without a reported violation, as well as in response to complaints.	Yes. Government can conduct periodic reviews without a reported violation, as well as in response to complaints.
Can the entire institution be reviewed?	Yes. HEW may investigate part or all of an institution.	Yes. EEOC may investigate part or all of an establishment.	Yes. Usually the Wage-Hour Division reviews the entire establishment.	Yes. HEW may investigate those parts of an institution which receive federal assistance (as well as other parts of the institution related to the program, whether or not they receive direct federal assistance). If the institution receives general institutional aid, the entire institution may be reviewed.	Yes. HEW may investigate those parts of an institution which receive federal assistance under Title VII and VIII (as well as other parts of the institution related to the program, whether or not they receive assistance under these titles).
Record keeping requirements and government access to records	Institution must keep and preserve specified records relevant to the determination of whether violations have occurred. Government is empowered to review all relevant records.	Institution must keep and preserve specified records relevant to the determination of whether violations have occurred. Government is empowered to review all relevant records.	Institution must keep and preserve specified records relevant to the determination of whether violations have occurred. Government is empowered to review all relevant records.	Institution must keep and preserve specified records relevant to the determination of whether violations have occurred. Government is empowered to review all relevant records.	Institution must keep and preserve specified records relevant to the determination of whether violations have occurred. Government is empowered to review all relevant records.
Enforcement power and sanctions	Government may delay new contracts, revoke current contracts, and debar institutions from eligibility for future contracts.	If attempts at conciliation fail, EEOC or the U.S. Attorney General may file suit. Aggrieved individuals may also initiate suits. Court may enjoin respondent from engaging in unlawful behaviour, order appropriate affirmative action, order reinstatement of employees and award back pay.	If voluntary compliance fails, Secretary of Labor may file suit. Aggrieved individuals may initiate suits when Department of Labor has not done so. Court may enjoin respondent from engaging in unlawful behavior, and order salary raises, back pay and assess interest.	Government may delay new awards, revoke current awards, and debar institutions from eligibility for future awards. Department of Justice may also bring suit at HEW's request.	Government may delay new awards, revoke current awards, and debar institution from eligibility for future awards. Department of Justice may also bring suit at HEW's request.
Can back pay be awarded?	Yes. HEW will seek back pay only for employees who were not previously protected by other laws allowing back pay.	Yes. For up to two years prior to filing charges with EEOC.	Yes. For up to two years for a nonwillful violation and three years for a willful violation.	Probably, to the extent that employees are covered.	Probably, to the extent that employees are covered.
Affirmative action requirements (There are no restrictions against action which is non-preferential)	Affirmative action plans including numerical goals and timetables are required of all contractors with contracts of $50,000 or more and 50 or more employees.	Affirmative action is not required unless charges have been filed, in which case it may be included in conciliation agreement or be ordered by the court.	Affirmative action, other than salary increases and back pay, is not required.	Affirmative action may be required after discrimination is found.	Affirmative action may be required after discrimination is found.
Coverage of labor organizations	Any agreement the contractor may have with a labor organization can not be in conflict with the contractor's affirmative action commitment.	Labor organizations are subject to the same requirements and sanctions as employers.	Labor organizations are prohibited from causing or attempting to cause an employer to discriminate on the basis of sex. Complaints may be made and suits brought against these organizations.	Procedure not yet clear. Any agreement the institution may have with a labor organization can not be in conflict with the non-discrimination provisions of the legislation.	Procedure not yet clear. Any agreement the institution may have with a labor organization can not be in conflict with the non-discrimination provisions of the legislation.

Is harassment prohibited?	Institutions are prohibited from discharging or discriminating against any employee or applicant for employment because he/she has made a complaint, assisted with an investigation or instituted proceedings.	Institutions are prohibited from discharging or discriminating against any employee or applicant for employment because he/she has made a complaint, assisted with an investigation or instituted proceedings.	Institutions are prohibited from discharging or discriminating against any employee because he/she has made a complaint, assisted with an investigation or instituted proceedings.	Institutions will be prohibited from discharging or discriminating against any participant or potential participant because he/she has made a complaint, assisted with an investigation or instituted proceedings.	Institutions will be prohibited from discharging or discriminating against any participant or potential participant because he/she has made a complaint, assisted with an investigation or instituted proceedings.
Notification of complaints	Notification of complaints has been erratic in the past. HEW is proposing notifying institutions of complaints within 10 days. HEW notifies institutions a few weeks prior to investigation.	EEOC notifies institutions of complaints within 10 days.	Complaint procedure is very informal. Employer under review may or may not know that a violation has been reported.	Procedure not yet determined.	Procedure not yet determined.
Confidentiality of names	Individual complainant's name is usually given to the institution. Investigation findings are kept confidential by government, but can be revealed by the institution. Policy concerning government disclosure concerning investigations and complaints has not yet been issued. The aggrieved party and respondent are not bound by the confidentiality requirement.	Individual complainant's name is divulged when an investigation is made. Charges are not made public by EEOC, nor can any of its efforts during the conciliation process be made public by the commission or its employees. If court action becomes necessary, the identity of the parties involved becomes a matter of public record. The aggrieved party and respondent are not bound by the confidentiality requirement.	The identity of a complainant, as well as the employer (and union, if involved), is kept in strict confidance.[1] If court action becomes necessary, the identity of the parties involved becomes a matter of public record. The aggrieved party and respondent are not bound by the confidentiality requirement.	Identity of complainant is kept confidential if possible. If court action becomes necessary, the identity of the parties involved becomes a matter of public record. The aggrieved party and respondent are not bound by the confidentiality requirement.	Identity of complainant is kept confidential if possible. If court action becomes necessary, the identity of the parties involved becomes a matter of public record. The aggrieved party and respondent are not bound by the confidentiality requirement.
For further information, contact	Division of Higher Education Office for Civil Rights Department of HEW Washington, D.C. 20201 or Office of Federal Contract Compliance Employment Standards Administration Department of Labor Washington, D.C. 20210 or Regional HEW or DOL Office	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 1800 G Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20506 or Regional EEOC Office	Wage and Hour Division Employment Standards Administration Department of Labor Washington, D.C. 20210 or Field, Area, or Regional Wage and Hour Office	Division of Higher Education Office for Civil Rights Department of HEW Washington, D.C. 20201 or Regional HEW Office	Division of Higher Education Office for Civil Rights Department of HEW Washington, D.C. 20201 or Regional HEW Office

association of
american colleges

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR FOOTNOTES.

(Division of Higher Education) conducts the reviews and investigations.

Footnotes

General

1. State employment and/or human relations laws may also apply to educational institutions. The Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, passed by the Congress and now in the process of ratification would, when ratified, forbid discrimination in publicly supported schools at all levels, including students and faculty.

2. Unless otherwise specified, "institution" includes public and private colleges and universities, elementary and secondary schools, and preschools.

3. A bona fide seniority or merit system is permitted under all legislation, provided the system is not discriminatory on the basis of sex or any other prohibited ground.

4. There are no restrictions against making a complaint under more than one anti-discrimination law at the same time.

5. This time limit refers to the time between an alleged discriminatory act and when a complaint is made. In general, however, the time limit is interpreted liberally when a continuing practice of discrimination is being challenged, rather than a single, isolated discriminatory act.

6. Back pay cannot be awarded prior to the effective date of the legislation.

Executive Order 11246 as amended by 11375

7. The definition of "contract" is very broad and is interpreted to cover all government contracts (even if nominally entitled "grants") which involve a benefit to the federal government.

8. As of January 19, 1973, all covered educational institutions, both public and private, must have *written* affirmative action plans.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act

9. In certain states that have fair employment laws with prohibitions similar to those of Title VII, EEOC automatically defers investigation of charges to the state agency for 60 days. (At the end of this period, EEOC will handle the charges unless the state is actively pursuing the case. About 85 per cent of deferred cases return to EEOC for processing after deferral.)

10. Due to an ambiguity in the law as it relates to public institutions, it is not yet clear whether EEOC *or* the Attorney General will file suit in all situations which involve public institutions.

Equal Pay Act of 1963 as amended by the Education Amendments of 1972 (Higher Education Act)

11. Over 95 per cent of all Equal Pay Act investigations are resolved through voluntary compliance.

12. Unless court action is necessary, the name of the parties need not be revealed. The identity of a complainant or a person furnishing information is never revealed without that person's knowledge and consent.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Higher Education Act)

(Minority women are also protected from discrimination on the basis of their race or color by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.)

13. Final regulations and guidelines for Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 have not yet been published. This chart includes information which is explicitly stated in the law, as well as how the law is likely to be interpreted in light of other precedents and developments.

14. The sex discrimination provision of Title IX is patterned after Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids discrimination on the basis of race, color and national origin in all federally assisted programs. By specific exemption, the prohibitions of Title VI do not cover employment practices (except where the primary objective of the federal aid is to provide employment). However, there is no similar exemption for employment in Title IX.

15. Title IX states that: "No person . . . shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. . . ."

16. The following are exempted from the *admissions* provision:

Private undergraduate institutions.

Elementary and secondary schools other than vocational schools.

Single-sex public undergraduate institutions. (If public single-sex undergraduate institutions decide to admit both sexes, they will have 7 years to admit female and male students on a nondiscriminatory basis, provided their plans are approved by the Commissioner of Education.)

Note 1. *These exemptions apply to admissions only.* Such institutions are still subject to all other anti-discrimination provisions of the Act.

Note 2. Single-sex professional, graduate and vocational schools at all levels have until July, 1979, to achieve nondiscriminatory admissions, provided their plans are approved by the Commissioner of Education.

17. Under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which Title IX of the Education Amendments closely parallels, federal agencies which extend aid to educational institutions have delegated their enforcement powers to HEW. A similar delegation of enforcement power is expected under Title IX.

Title VII & Title VIII of the Public Health Service Act as amended by the Comprehensive Health Manpower Act & the Nurse Training Amendments Act of 1971

18. Final regulations and guidelines for Title VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act have not yet been published. This chart includes information which is explicitly stated in the law, as well as how the law is likely to be interpreted in light of other precedents and developments.

19. Schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, public health, allied public health personnel and nursing are specifically mentioned in Titles VII and VIII. Regulations issued June 1, 1972, by the Secretary of HEW specify that *all* entities applying for awards under Titles VII or VIII are subject to the nondiscrimination requirements of the act.

20. HEW regulations state: "Nondiscrimination in admission to a training program includes nondiscrimination in all practices relating to applicants to and students in the program; nondiscrimination in the enjoyment of every right, privilege and opportunity secured by admission to the program; and nondiscrimination in all employment practices relating to employees working directly with applicants to or students in the program."

This document may be reproduced without permission, provided that credit is given to the "Project on the Status & Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009."

DOSSIERS OF CANDIDATES

CANDIDATE A: _____

Ph.D., Ohio State University Speciality: Black Literature
Seeking first full-time teaching position.
Excellent teaching evaluations as part-time teaching assistant at Ohio State.
Married, one child. Age 26. Birthplace: Smalltown, Ohio
No publications.
Average-to-good recommendations from graduate school professors.
H.E.W. Information: Black male.

CANDIDATE B: _____

Ph.D., Yale University Speciality: Modern British Novel
No teaching experience.
Single, age 28. Birthplace: Chicago suberb
Publications: One scholarly article "in press".
"Rave" recommendations from Big Names at Yale.
H.E.W. Information: White male. (Ethnic background unknown)

CANDIDATE C: _____

Ph.D., Columbia University. Speciality: Feminist Literature
Three years teaching experience in English and Women's Studies.
Single, one child. Age 34. Birthplace: New York City.
Publications: Two articles, one in English scholarly journal, one in popular feminist magazine
Recommendations mixed -- some former professors consider her "pushy".
H.E.W. Information: White female (Ethnic background unknown)

CANDIDATES' ROLES

CANDIDATE A

FOR THIS ROLE, ASSUME YOU ARE A BLACK MALE

You are a candidate for a postiton in the English Department of this college. You have recently received your Ph.D. from Ohio State University, and your specialty is Black Literature. You are married, age 26, and have one child. You grew up in a small Ohio town where your father was a Methodist Minister. You are not very political. You consider yourself an excellent teacher (students rave about you) and you want to be hired on merit. You have no interest in publishing. You are worried about the possibility that subtle racial prejudice may affect your chances of getting this job -- you have heard that the school is conservative, with few Blacks on the faculty. BE PREPARED TO MAKE A SHORT STATEMENT ON YOUR OWN BEHALF AT THE INTERVIEW/HEARING.

CANDIDATE B

FOR THIS ROLE, ASSUME YOU ARE A WHITE MALE

You are a candidate for a position in the English Department of this college. You have recently received your Ph.D. from Yale University, where you were the protege of one of the Big Name professors and you are on a first name basis with several others. Your dissertation was on Modern British Fiction. You are single, age 28, from an upper-middle-class Chicago suburb. You have no teaching experience but have recently received word that a scholarly article of yours has been accepted for publication in a good journal. You are confident and a "go getter". You feel that you are the best qualified candidate of those being interviewed and consider yourself entitled to the position because of your "superior" training and scholarly potential. You are hostile to Affirmative Action as you understand it, and plan to make a complaint of "reverse discrimination" if a less qualified ethnic or woman gets the job. BE PREPARED TO MAKE A SHORT STATEMENT ON YOUR OWN BEHALF AT THE INTERVIEW/HEARING.

CANDIDATE C

FOR THIS ROLE, ASSUME YOU ARE A WHITE FEMALE

You are a candidate for a position in the English Department of this college. You received your Ph.D. from Columbia four years ago, writing your dissertation on Feminist Literature. You are single with one 3-year-old child, and you are worried about the problems you will face as a working mother in a small conservative town like this one. You are a New Yorker, born and bred, and proud of it, very competent and not afraid to speak out for your beliefs. (Some of your graduate school professors found you abrasive, but you attribute their attitudes to sexism.) You have published two articles, one scholarly and one popular. You have taught both English and Women's Studies for three years and thus have more teaching experience than either of the other candidates. You consider yourself the best qualified candidate and if you are not hired you will attribute it to discrimination. BE PREPARED TO MAKE A SHORT STATEMENT ON YOUR OWN BEHALF AT THE INTERVIEW/HEARING.

STUDENT ROLES

STUDENT

As head of the Black Student Union on campus, you are a student leader and an aggressive, outspoken critic of hiring patterns at the college. You consider the administration insincere in their claims that they want to hire more Blacks and women. You feel that the needs of Black Students, especially, have been ignored and you seize every opportunity to make that point clear.

STUDENT

As the editor of the campus student newspaper, you actively seek out any and all news of interest to your readers. You are particularly proud of your reputation for investigative reporting on controversial campus issues. You like to stimulate debate - to participate in making the news as well as reporting it. You are here on official assignment and will try to get some good interviews.

STUDENT

As president of the campus Women's Caucus (a feminist organization), you have a reputation for being outspoken and somewhat radical. You consider yourself an astute politician and have been working hard to get the college to hire and promote more women. You firmly believe that women students need effective "role models" of their own sex if they are to succeed in life, and hope that the administration will hire more women for <u>this</u> reason, even if they cannot be convinced to do so on moral grounds alone.

STUDENT

You are president of the Student Government Association. You are a "good politician" and plan to use the issue of the college's failure to meet Affirmative Action goals in your coming re-election campaign. However, because you have your eye on that campaign, you might shift your position somewhat if the majority appears to be favoring the other side. You are anxious to appear wise and judicious to the administration, and a fearless innovator to your student constituents.

ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES

PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE -- Ph.D., Chicago, U.S. History. Former success: Director of Admissions. Ethical, indecisive, good natured, uneasy in conflict situations and does not wish to offend anyone. Tends to respond to situations as they arise. Can be manipulated by strong personalities. Gives unpleasant tasks to the Provost, your second in command.
Married, 4 children. Members of the Episcopal Church.

PROVOST -- Ph.D., Philosophy, Chicago University (Second in command to President of the college.) Does the President's "dirty work", but feels the President is "weak." Very strong leadership style, intolerant of criticism and defensive about the college's policies and public image. No clear-cut goals, but frequently intervenes on the departmental level when major policy decisions are at stake. Married, 3 children. Attends the Episcopal Church, but was raised as a Presbyterian.

ALUMNI TRUSTEE — Big financial supporter of the college, especially its athletic programs. Remembers the college as it was in the "good ole days." Worries about "new types" taking over and destroying the religious heritage of the college. Fears hiring women and minorities will lower standards and hurt the reputation of the college. Prefers not to take a public stand on these issues, but is quite capable of doing so, if necessary. A good organizer and politician. A good Presbyterian.

CHAPLAIN -- Liberal, married, no children. Ex-minister of a Methodist Church in a small Indiana town. Doctor of Divinity degree. Outspoken and a bit self-righteous. Speaks often of "moral values" and "integrity." Disparages motives of others. Close friend and ally of the Affirmative Action Officer. You support either Candidate A or C, and must be persuaded by the highest moral concerns in your choice.

TRUSTEE — President of United Plastics Corporation. Believes the college should be run like a business. Impatient with academics--considers them impractical, idealistic and bad businessmen. Wants to put the college on a sound business and administrative footing. Republican, Ford supporter, albeit reluctantly. Wants to "hire cheaply," and advocates rotating younger faculty in untenured/untenurable slots, letting them go after a few years. This policy is referred to as the "revolving doors policy" or as the practice of "circulating talent." Therefore, you try to hire the least expensive candidate and hopefully one who will not mind being told not to expect a permanent job or tenure.

ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES (continued)

ASSISTANT DEAN, COUNSELING -- Single, Black, M.S., Ohio State University, 1975. Basketball scholarship paid for college education. Member of "Jack and Jill," Black upper-middle class educational organization. Member of Southern Baptist Church. Supports Jimmy Carter. Strong philosophical commitment to equal opportunity for minorities. Feels white women have nothing to complain about. Primary counsellor for Black students on campus and often voices Black student concerns in faculty forums. You do not have faculty status and therefore cannot vote in faculty meetings, hearings, or committees, although you may attend as a non-voting member of the college administration.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICER -- Young, Black psychologist. Teaches half-time and serves as half-time administrator of the college's Affirmative Action plan. Worried that other administrators and faculty are not serious about implementing Affirmative Action and feels the college is making only "token" efforts to meet the goals of the plan. Outspokenly committed to the hiring of more women and ethnics. A close friend and ally of the chaplain, who shares the same views. FAMILIARIZE YOURSELF WITH THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FACT SHEETS AND BE PREPARED TO MAKE A SHORT INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT AT THE INTERVIEW/HEARING. STRESS THE NEED TO FULFILL THE GOALS AND MORAL OBLIGATIONS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION.

FACULTY ROLES

PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY -- Tenured, full-professor, not on the English faculty. Ph.D., Columbia University. Fair-minded and objective. Determined to hire the best candidate for the position. Former Rhodes Scholar. Interview other members of the faculty/administration about their preference of the candidates and try to assess them objectively. At a time to be specified you will chair a faculty hearing to discuss the hiring issue. You may not vote unless the faculty is tied. Also try to mediate between opposing faculty factions.

CHAIRPERSON OF THE ADVISORY BOARD -- As a tenured, full professor in a science field you chair this most powerful faculty policy-making body. A believer in high academic standards, you are willing to compromise -- for a price. Your initial impulse is to support Candidate B. Married. No children.

HEAD OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT -- Tenured, full professor, author of two books on Chaucer. Emphasizes scholarly research. Runs the English Department in a highly authoritarian manner. You fear the Administration will try to impose its candidate upon your department. You detest Affirmative Action. You are concerned with sagging enrollments. Try to convince other members of the English Department to follow your lead.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT - - Ph.D., Wisconsin. Tenured, but only after students protested when Advisory Board denied you tenure last Spring. Political leftist, pacifist, active in Civil Rights and Anti-War Movements. Likes to "stir things up." No publications. Unmarried. Supports Affirmative Action plan on campus, but has some reservations about the women's movement.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT -- Former Dean of Students, emphasizes teaching excellence and is a very popular teacher. Likes role of peacemaker, conciliator. Active in community affairs. Supports the candidate most likely to appeal to the student body. Divorced. Ph.D, Vanderbilt.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT - - Ph.D., University of Nebraska. Untenured. Energetic, sports enthusiast. Do not believe that qualified blacks and women encounter discrimination in the academic world. Supports teaching excellence. No publications. Married, 2 small children.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, POLITICAL SCIENCE -- Black. Ph.D., Emory, 1976. Hired June, 1976. Untenured. Teaches only introductory courses. Wants to hire more Blacks and wants to offer course on Ethnic Politics. Resents "tokenism" and does not feel the college fully utilizes its Black faculty. Counsels Black students on academic matters.

FACULTY ROLES

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT -- B.A., M.A., A.B.D., Michigan State. (expects Ph.D. degree as soon as dissertation is finished). Untenured. Offers introductory courses in writing and composition. Heavy student load. Feels overworked and underpaid, but is afraid to "rock the boat." No publications. Dedicated teacher. Married, first child expected soon. Confidential: You do not want to hire a candidate who threatens your own position or would be competitive.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT - - Ph.D., Yale, tenured. Good East Coast connections. Expert at grantsmanship. Wants to insure continued federal assistance ($$$$$) by hiring minorities and women. Member of Advisory Board, most powerful policy-making body on campus. Published poetry in obscure literary journals. Has little contact or sympathy with ethnics on a personal level. Feels most women should not enter the professional world. Has a happy marriage, no children.

POET IN RESIDENCE, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT ("The Tinker Visiting Assistant Professor of Modern American Rhetoric") -- Working-class background, Jewish, Zionist. Committed to principle of equal employment opportunities for all, irrespective of race, creed, or class. Strong, engaging, persuasive personality. Single. Ex-publisher of an "underground" poetry magazine. Open-minded. Adviser to student newspaper.

LECTURER, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT -- M.A. only. Untenured. Teaches introductory courses. Heavy student load. Feels "used" by the Department, even though the Chairperson of the Department once gave you a semester's leave (without pay) to finish your dissertation. Is torn between family responsibilities and career (i.e., need to publish, give papers, and finish the long-overdue dissertation.) Married, two children. Special instructions: Try to "get the ear" of the candidates being interviewed and warn them not to become associated with the college. Your teaching is adequate, but not exceptional.

GROUP PROCESS OBSERVER ROLES

GROUP PROCESS OBSERVER -- Your role in the simulation is to observe participants and record your observations on Recording Forms. One of the facilitators will meet privately with Process Observers to give you special instructions.

(Structure)

GROUP PROCESS OBSERVER -- Your role in the simulation is to observe participants and record your observations on Recording Forms. One of the facilitators will meet privately with Process Observers to give you special instructions.

(Climate)

GROUP PROCESS OBSERVER -- Your role in the simulation is to observe participants and record your observations on Recording Forms. One of the facilitators will meet privately with Process Observers to give you special instructions.

(Facilitation)

GROUP PROCESS OBSERVER - - Your role in the simulation is to observe participants and record your observations on Recording Forms. One of the facilitators will meet privately with Process Observers to give you special instructions.

(Dysfunctions)

GROUP PROCESS OBSERVER -- Your role in the simulation is to observe participants and record your observations on Recording Forms. One of the facilitators will meet privately with Process Observers to give you special instructions.

(Convergence)

GUIDELINES FOR GROUP PROCESS OBSERVERS

1. Wear white card. Can mingle among the participants, but cannot speak or otherwise communicate.

2. Pay particular attention to leadership styles in observing Group Structure, Climate, Facilitation, Dysfunctions and Convergence.

    a) List the leaders (by role) and describe their style.
    b) What types of leadership styles were most effective?

3. You may confer with other Group Process Observers during the simulation, but do so out of the hearing of role participants.

4. You may approach the facilitator at any time for conferences, exchanges of impressions, etc.

5. At the end of the hearing in the simulation, meet briefly to outline your major observations, per category:

    Prepare a group presentation to role participants. You will be called upon by the facilitators to give positive and negative feedback to the group as a whole. (ongoing exchanges will speed this up.)

6. The facilitators would like to collect the Group Process Recording Forms after the session to aid them in future game demonstrations.

PROCESS OBSERVER RECORDING FORM

Record verbal and non verbal behaviors engaged in by specific members of the group in the section on this form assigned to you. Guide your observations by the statements and questions included in your section. Try to focus on the processes that emerge in the meeting rather than on the content of what is said.

1. Structure: how the group organizes to accomplish its task. What ground rules emerge? What leadership behaviors are displayed? How are decisions made? How is information treated?

PROCESS OBSERVER RECORDING FORM

Record verbal and non verbal behaviors engaged in by specific members of the group in the section on this form assigned to you. Guide your observations by the statements and questions included in your section. Try to focus on the processes that emerge in the meeting rather than on the content of what is said.

II. Climate: the psychological atmosphere of the meeting. How are feelings (as opposed to points of view) dealt with. What nonverbal behavior indicates changes in climate? How do members' voices denote feeling tone?

PROCESS OBSERVER RECORDING FORM

Record verbal and non verbal behaviors engaged in by specific members of the group in the section on the form assigned to you. Guide your observations by the statements and questions included in your section. Try to focus on the processes that emerge in the meeting rather than on the content of what is said.

III. Facilitation: how group members influence the development of the group. Does the group process itself? What group-building behaviors (bringing in silent members, harmonizing conflict, reinforcing participation, etc.) are engaged in?

PROCESS OBSERVER RECORDING FORM

Record verbal and non verbal behaviors engaged in by specific members of the group in the section on this form assigned to you. Guide your observations by the statements and questions included in your section. Try to focus on the processes that emerge in the meeting rather than on the content of what is said.

IV. Dysfunctions: behaviors that hinder the accomplishment of the group's task. What anti-group behaviors (blocking, recognition-seeking, dominating, withdrawing, etc.) are seen? What communication patterns develop that are dysfunctional to the group?

PROCESS OBSERVER RECORDING FORM

Record verbal and non verbal behaviors engaged in by specific members of the group in the section on this form assigned to you. Guide your observations by the statements and questions included in your section. Try to focus on the processes that emerge in the meeting rather than on the content of what is said.

V. Convergence: how the group oves from independence to collective judgements. What behavior promotes agreement? What concensus seeking behaviors are observed? What "false" concensus behaviors (such as "me too," "I'll go along with that") are displayed?

EVALUATION OF THE GAME

Indicate your sex:
__ Female __Male

Occupation/Position _____

Institutional Affiliation, if any:

_____

Have you ever taught Womens's Studies?
___yes ___no

To which type of role were you assigned?

___Administration ___Candidate ___Faculty ___Student ___Process Observer

Did you have the opportunity in JOB CRUNCH to choose your sex role? ___yes ___no

If yes, what sex did your role character favor, and why? _____

_____

Do you agree with this choice? Explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements by putting a check ( ) in the appropriate place:

1 - Agree 2 - Neutral or don't know 3 - Disagree

		1	2	3
1.	I am sympathetic to the Women's Movement.	( )	( )	( )
2.	Women are gaining power in colleges and universities at the expense of the ethnics.	( )	( )	( )
3.	I support Affirmative Action.	( )	( )	( )
4.	Affirmative Action has caused hiring to become more objective.	( )	( )	( )
5.	More women than men favor the Equal Rights Amendment.	( )	( )	( )
6.	I enjoyed the simulation.	( )	( )	( )
7.	I found it easy to get into my character's role.	( )	( )	( )
8.	My role allowed me a sufficient degree of freedom of action.	( )	( )	( )
9.	I anticipate using this format in my teaching (if appl.)	( )	( )	( )
10.	Getting a job still depends upon "who you know."	( )	( )	( )
11.	I felt angry and confused at times during the simulation.	( )	( )	( )
12.	I played my role character as a stereotype or caricature.	( )	( )	( )
13.	Women and ethnics are still primarily tokens in the university system.	( )	( )	( )
14.	Affirmative Action guidelines are too weak to deal effectively with discrimination.	( )	( )	( )

EVALUATION OF THE GAME (Continued)

	1	2	3
15. The simulation made clear:			
a) What Affirmative Action is	( )	( )	( )
b) Some arguments in favor of Affirmative Action	( )	( )	( )
c) Some objections to Affirmative Action	( )	( )	( )
d) The subtleties of the hiring process	( )	( )	( )
e) Problems women face in the job market	( )	( )	( )
f) Problems ethnics face in the job market	( )	( )	( )

16. As a result of participating in JOB CRUNCH:

I am more aware of the problems involved in implementing Affirmative Action.	( )	( )	( )
I have changed/modified my position on Affirmative Action.	( )	( )	( )

Explain:

17. How well did the exercise simulate reality?
Comment:

18. Briefly list any deficiencies or limitations of JOB CRUNCH you have observed:

19. Do you feel this simulation is useful as a learning device for:
college students? for adults?

20. Did this Evaluation Form give you an adequate opportunity to express your responses to JOB CRUNCH?
Comment:

Please address correspondence about this game to: Dr. Joan Straumanis
Department of Philosophy
Denison University
Granville, Ohio 43023